arXiv:1605.07822v1 [gr-qc] 25 May 2016

Constraining the Nordtvedt parameter with the BepiColombo Radioscience experiment

Fabrizio De Marchi,[1,*] Giacomo Tommei,[2] Andrea Milani,[2] and Giulia Schettino[2]

[1] *Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Sapienza University of Rome, Via Eudossiana, 18, 00184 Rome, Italy*

[2] *Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 6, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

BepiColombo is a joint ESA/JAXA mission to Mercury with challenging objectives regarding geophysics, geodesy and fundamental physics. The Mercury Orbiter Radioscience Experiment (MORE) is one of the on-board experiments, including three different but linked experiments: gravimetry, rotation and relativity. The aim of the relativity experiment is the measurement of the post-Newtonian parameters. Thanks to accurate tracking between Earth and spacecraft, the results are expected to be very precise. However, the outcomes of the experiment strictly depends on our "knowledge" about solar system: ephemerides, number of bodies (planets, satellites and asteroids) and their masses. In this paper we describe a semi-analytic model used to perform a covariance analysis to quantify the effects, on the relativity experiment, due to the uncertainties of solar system bodies parameters. In particular, our attention is focused on the Nordtvedt parameter η used to parametrize the strong equivalence principle violation.
After our analysis we estimated $\sigma[\eta] \lessapprox 4.5 \times 10^{-5}$ which is about 1 order of magnitude larger than the "ideal" case where masses of planets and asteroids have no errors. The current value, obtained from ground based experiments and lunar laser ranging measurements, is $\sigma[\eta] \approx 4.4 \times 10^{-4}$.
Therefore, we conclude that, even in presence of uncertainties on solar system parameters, the measurement of η by MORE can improve the current precision of about 1 order of magnitude.

I. INTRODUCTION

BepiColombo (BC) is a joint ESA/JAXA mission aimed at the exploration of Mercury. The mission is composed by two spacecrafts, the ESA Mercury Planetary Orbiter (MPO) and the JAXA Mercury Magnetospheric Orbiter (MMO), to be put in orbit around Mercury: launch is scheduled for April, 2018 and the orbit insertion for December, 2024. The nominal duration of the whole mission is 1 year, with a possible extension to 2 years.

The Mercury Orbiter Radioscience Experiment (MORE) is one of the on board experiments whose goals are:

a) to determine the gravity field of Mercury and its rotation state (gravimetry and rotation experiments);

b) to study possible violations of the general relativity (GR) theory of gravitation (relativity experiment);

c) to provide the spacecraft position for geodesy experiments;

d) to contribute to planetary ephemerides improvement.

Such precise experiments are possible thanks to a multi-frequency radio link (in X and K_a bands) allowing to eliminate the uncertainty in the refraction index due to plasma content along the radio waves path [1]. The MORE experiment provides the necessary K_a-band transponder and the system to compare the delays in a 5-way link, in combination with instruments installed at the ground stations.

Orders of magnitude for the accuracy which can be achieved in this way are 3 micron/s in range-rate (two-way, at 1000 s of integration time) and 30 cm in range (two-way, at 300 s of integration time): the relative accuracy in range is better than 10^{-12}. This implies the signal to noise ratio (S/N) of all the relativistic effects (both in the dynamics and in the observation equations) is very large, in particular for the range measurements. By using the nonlinear least squares method, range and range-rate data will be fitted to an accurate theoretical model to estimate the physical parameters relative to MORE as well as their uncertainties.

One of the most ambitious purposes of the mission is to attempt to constrain the Nordtvedt parameter η describing violations of the strong equivalence principle (SEP). The equivalence principle (EP) states the equality between inertial and gravitational mass. As a consequence, there is the universality of the free fall that allows the geometrical description of the gravity in GR. So far, there is no experimental disproof of it. In its weak form the EP states that strong and electro-weak interactions do not influence the falling of a body, with a negligible self-gravity, in an external gravity field. This is called the weak equivalence principle (WEP). The strong form extends the validity of the EP to bodies with measurable self gravitational energy, like stars or planets. The inequality between inertial mass m_i^I and gravitational mass m_i^G of a body can be parametrized as [2–4]

$$m_i^G = m_i^I(1 + \delta_i + \eta\,\Omega_i), \tag{1}$$

where Ω_i is the ratio between self-gravitational and rest

* Corresponding author: fabrizio.demarchi@uniroma1.it

energy of the body.

The validity of the WEP corresponds to $\delta_i = 0$ and $\Omega_i = 0$. On the other hand, when $\Omega_i \neq 0$, if both δ_i and η are zero the SEP is valid. The values of Ω_i for the Sun, Earth and Moon are, respectively $\Omega_s = -3.52 \times 10^{-6}$; $\Omega_e = -4.64 \times 10^{-10}$; $\Omega_m = -1.88 \times 10^{-11}$ [5].

Since Newton, EP has been tested several times by laboratory experiments, mainly by torsion balances, but laboratory objects have a very small self-gravity ($\Omega_i \lessapprox 10^{-26}$), therefore no information about SEP can arise from ground based experiments only. Hence, an EP test is in practice a WEP test.

The first test of the EP involving celestial bodies (Earth, Moon and Sun) has been proposed by Nordtvedt [6]: in case of EP violation the different rate of free falling of Earth and Moon towards the Sun generates a signal in the Earth-Moon range. This signal carries information about both WEP and SEP since Earth and Moon have different gravitational self-energies but also compositions. Regarding the SEP violation, the amplitude of the signal on Earth-Moon distance is proportional to $(\Omega_e - \Omega_m)$, at the Moon's synodic frequency, and it has been estimated to be $\approx 13\,\eta$ meters (the so-called Nordtvedt effect). In order to separate weak and strong EP, laboratory results involving test bodies with chemical composition similar to that of Earth and Moon have been used. The precision achieved on WEP measurements is currently $\sigma[\delta a_{WEP}/a] = 1.4 \times 10^{-13}$ [7], but this result is expected to be improved by 2 orders of magnitude thanks to the recently launched ESA mission MICROSCOPE [8]. The Earth-Moon distance has been measured with increasing precision in the last 46 years by lunar laser ranging (LLR) [9] and the precision on Earth-Moon relative differential accelerations is currently $\sigma[\delta a_{em}/a_\odot] = 1.3 \times 10^{-13}$ [5]. This result is comparable to that achieved by ground experiments.

In order to estimate η is necessary to consider both experiments and the resulting RMS is $\sigma[\eta] = 4.4 \times 10^{-4}$ [5, 7, 10].

SEP violation can be tested also by planetary ranging, i.e. by radio-tracking between Earth and an object orbiting around the Sun (a spacecraft or another planet). The advantages with respect to the Earth-Moon tests are: *i*) the signal is proportional to Ω_s which is 4 orders of magnitude larger than $\Omega_e - \Omega_m$ and *ii*) the baseline is in general larger [11].

A test for the SEP violation by ranging measurements between Earth and L_1 or L_2 Earth-Sun Lagrangian points has been recently proposed by [4], while the same experiment by Earth-Mars or Earth-Phobos ranging has been described by [10–12].

Thanks to precise Earth-Mercury range measurements, the BC mission will provide data to estimate with good accuracy η and other post-Newtonian (PN) parameters [2, 13]. Regarding the EP, the expected precision for relative Earth-Mercury acceleration is $\sigma[\delta a_{earth-merc.}/a_\odot] \approx 10^{-11}$. It is 2 orders of magnitude worse than the precision achieved by laboratory tests, therefore the EP violation test of BC is in practice a SEP test. Moreover, the SEP violation signal is proportional to Ω_s, therefore the parameter η can be estimated with high precision.

The purpose of this work is to quantify $\sigma[\eta]$ in presence of systematic effects due to planets and asteroids. To do this, we will use both a numerical approach (by using the software *ORBIT14*, described in Section II) and an analytical one. This latter being necessary to take into account the effects of the experimental uncertainties of gravitational parameters ($\mu_i = Gm_i^G$, hereafter GPs) of planets and asteroids.

This paper has the following structure. In Section II we are going to give a brief description of the mathematical models and of the structure of the simulation software used and we will present the result of a nominal simulation of the relativity experiment. Section III is devoted to the detailed description of the experiment to estimate η and of the analytical method followed. Finally, in Section IV we will draw some conclusions.

II. MATHEMATICAL MODELS AND SOFTWARE STRUCTURE

In this section we briefly describe the mathematical models that are the basis of the software *ORBIT14* built to process the data of MORE and used as simulation software to infer some results about the estimation of parameters. *ORBIT14*, has been developed in the last six years by the Celestial Mechanics Group of the University of Pisa and it has the capability to simulate the *relativity experiment*, the *gravimetry and rotation experiment* [14] of the BC mission, and also the Radioscience experiment of the NASA mission JUNO [15].

Concerning the relativity experiment, we need to solve an orbit determination problem with a full relativistic model (also for the observable computations, see [16]), including the terms expressing the violations of general relativity with the PN parameters, such as $\gamma, \beta, \eta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$.

The equations of motion of Mercury and of the Earth-Moon barycenter (EMB) have been implemented using the parametric post-Newtonian approach: they are linearized with respect to the small parameters v_i^2/c^2 and $G\,m_i/(c^2\,r_{ik})$, where v_i is the barycentric velocity for each of the bodies of mass m_i, c the speed of light and r_{ik} a mutual distance, appearing in the metric of the curved space-time, hence in the equations for geodesic motion. This can be done adding to the Lagrangian of the N-body problem some corrective terms of PN order 1 in the small parameters (as described in [13]).

Here we are interested in the model for the violation of SEP. We can consider that there are for each body i two quantities $\mu_i = Gm_i^G$ and $\mu_i^I = Gm_i^I$, one in the gravitational potential (including the relativistic part) and the other in the kinetic energy, not considering the relativistic correction for the masses. If there is a violation of the SEP involving body i, with a fraction Ω_i of its mass due to gravitational self-energy, then from Eq. (1) and

neglecting WEP

$$\mu_i = \mu_i^I\,(1+\eta\,\Omega_i) \Longleftrightarrow \mu_i^I = \mu_i\,(1-\eta\,\Omega_i) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2)\ . \quad (2)$$

Neglecting $\mathcal{O}(\eta^2)$ terms this is expressed by a Lagrangian term $\eta\,L_\eta$, with an effect on body i:

$$L_\eta = -\frac{1}{2}\,\sum_i\,\Omega_i\,\mu_i\,v_i^2 \implies \frac{d^2\mathbf{r}_i}{dt^2} = (1+\eta\,\Omega_i)\,\left.\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}_i}{dt^2}\right|_{\eta=0}\ . \quad (3)$$

The largest effect of η is a change in the center of mass integral (where dots stand for terms of order 2 PN and higher, including the neglected terms in the masses)

$$\mathbf{P} = \sum_j \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j} = \sum_j\,(1-\eta\,\Omega_i)\,\mu_i\,\mathbf{v}_j + \dots\ ,\quad \frac{d\mathbf{P}}{dt} = \mathbf{0} \quad (4)$$

and if the center of mass is the origin, the position of the Sun has to be corrected (to indicate the Sun we use the subscript "0")

$$\mathbf{r}_0 = \frac{-1}{\mu_0\,(1-\eta\,\Omega_0)}\sum_{j\neq 0}(1-\eta\Omega_j)\,\mu_j\,\mathbf{r}_j + \dots\ . \quad (5)$$

The partial derivative of the acceleration of the body j with respect to η is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}_j}{dt^2} = \Omega_j\left[\frac{\mu_0}{r_{j0}^3}\,\mathbf{r}_{j0} + \sum_{i\neq j,0}\frac{\mu_i}{r_{ji}^3}\mathbf{r}_{ji}\right] + \frac{\partial\mathbf{r}_0}{\partial\eta}\frac{\partial(\mu_0/r_{j0}^3)}{\partial\mathbf{r}_0}\,, \quad (6)$$

where the first term is the direct, the second the indirect η-perturbation, and

$$\frac{\partial\mathbf{r}_0}{\partial\eta} = \sum_{i\neq 0}\,(\Omega_j-\Omega_0)\,\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_0}\,\mathbf{r}_i\ . \quad (7)$$

By combining together and omitting smaller terms with $\Omega_i\,\mu_k$ (with $i,k\neq 0$) or $\mathcal{O}(\eta^2)$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}_j}{dt^2} = \Omega_j\,\mu_0\,\frac{\mathbf{r}_{j0}}{r_{j0}^3} - \Omega_0\,\frac{\partial(1/r_{j0}^3)}{\partial\mathbf{r}_0}\sum_{i\neq 0}\mu_i\,\mathbf{r}_i\ , \quad (8)$$

with a direct (small parameter $\Omega_j\,\mu_0$) and an indirect (small parameter $\Omega_0\,\mu_i$) part.

A. ORBIT14 software structure

Since the real data from the spacecraft will be available only in 2025, the first program of the software is the *simulator*, which generates fictitious sets of observables, non-gravitational accelerations and initial orbital elements for the probe at the central time of each observed arc. These are obtained by propagating the orbit of the spacecraft starting from some initial conditions taken by the spice kernel generated by the navigation team of the mission.

The core of the orbit determination software is the *corrector*, the purpose of which is to estimate the parameters we are interested in. This program is the one that will be used to analyze real data. The corrector follows a classical approach (see, for instance, [17]), and its aim is to perform a non linear least squares fit to compute a set of parameters $\mathbf{q}^*$ which minimizes the target function

$$Q(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{m}\boldsymbol{\xi}^T(\mathbf{q})\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i\xi_i^2(\mathbf{q}), \quad (9)$$

where m is the number of observations and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathcal{O}-\mathcal{C}$ is the vector of *residuals*, difference between the observed quantities $\mathcal{O}$ and the predicted ones $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{q})$, computed using suitable models and assumptions. In our case, the observed quantities are range and range-rate data, while the computed observables are the results of the light-time computation (see [16] for more details) as a function of all the quantities $\mathbf{q}$ we want to estimate (w_i is the weight associated to the $i-$observation).

The procedure to compute $\mathbf{q}^*$ is based on a modified Newton's method known in the literature as *differential corrections method*; see e.g. [17]. Let us define

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\xi}}{\partial\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{q}), \qquad \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}^\mathbf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{B}, \quad (10)$$

which are called the *design* matrix and the *normal* matrix, respectively. Then the correction:

$$\Delta\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{D} \quad \text{with}\,\mathbf{D} = -\mathbf{B}^\mathbf{T}\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\xi} \quad (11)$$

is applied iteratively until either Q does not change meaningfully from one iteration to the other or $\Delta\mathbf{q}$ becomes smaller than a given tolerance.

Concerning the observations, we suppose to have two ground stations, one observing in K_a-band at the Goldstone Deep Space Communications Complex in California (U.S.) and the other in X-band at the Cebreros station in Spain. With this scenario, the observations are split in arcs, with interruptions of tracking not exceeding one hour, namely the *observed arcs*, with a duration from 14 to 19 hours. The arcs are separated by intervals in the dark lasting from 5 to 10 hours. We call *extended arc* an observed arc broadened out from half of the dark period before it to half of the dark period after it.

In order to estimate the parameters we do not use a classical multi-arc strategy[18], as described for example in [17], but a **constrained multi-arc strategy**. This method is established on the idea that each observed arc belongs to the same object (the spacecraft) and thus the orbits corresponding to two subsequent extended arcs should coincide at the connection time in the middle of the non-observed interval (see [19] for more details).

B. Nominal simulation

The simulation scenario (the same as described in [20]) consists of a 365 arcs long simulation, which corresponds

parameter	**Formal sigma**
β	6.21×10^{-7}
γ	7.65×10^{-7}
η	1.93×10^{-6}
α_1	4.5×10^{-7}
α_2	7.6×10^{-8}
μ_0	3.9×10^{13}
$J_{2\odot}$	3.8×10^{-10}
$\zeta = \dot{\mu}_0/\mu_0$	2.0×10^{-14}

TABLE I. Results for PN and related parameters estimation in the "ideal" case (planetary masses have no errors). Units are [$\mathrm{cm}^3/\mathrm{s}^2$] for μ_0 and [yr^{-1}] for ζ .

to about one year, starting on March, 27th 2025. The main assumptions made are briefly described as follows:

- two ground stations are available for tracking, one at Goldstone Deep Space Communications Complex (California, USA) for the K_a-band and the other in Spain , at Cebreros station, for X-band; range measurements are taken every 120 s and range-rate every 30 s, both with top accuracies;
- we impose the Nordvedt equation [21], i.e. we assume a metric theory to remove the approximate symmetry between β and $J_{2\odot}$:

$$\eta = 4(\beta - 1) - (\gamma - 1) - \alpha_1 - \frac{2}{3}\alpha_2 \qquad (12)$$

The MORE relativity experiment consists in solving for the following parameters: the PN and related parameters (γ, β, η, α_1, α_2, $J_{2\odot}$, μ, ζ) plus 6 initial conditions for Mercury barycenter $\{X_m, Y_m, Z_m, \dot{X}_m, \dot{Y}_m, \dot{Z}_m\}$ and 6 for the EMB $\{X_e, Y_e, Z_e, \dot{X}_e, \dot{Y}_e, \dot{Z}_e\}$ with respect to the SSB in the Ecliptic J2000 reference frame[22]. Due to rank deficiency, among the 12 parameters (positions and velocities), only 8 can be determined simultaneously. They are position and velocity of Mercury and two components of the velocity of the EMB.
We solve for all the parameters listed above in a global least square fit. We performed both an analysis based on formal statistics (standard deviations and correlations) as given from the formal covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{C}^{-1}$, and an analysis based on "true" errors, defined as the difference between the value of parameters at convergence and the simulated value. We perform a statistical analysis over 10 runs, each time varying the random generator of Gaussian distribution and we consider as true error the distribution mean value. Concerning the convergence requirements, we imposed a tolerance treshold in target function variation between two subsequent iteration of 10^{-4} and we verified that the differential correction process reached this condition always in 6 iterations.
The results for PN and related parameters in terms of formal uncertainty are shown in Table I.

The parameters η and ζ present true errors always higher than formal ones because they are very sensitive to the effect of systematic errors in range. Nevertheless, the expected results of MORE could hence improve the actual knowledge, even if there are some intrinsic problems due to the uncertainties in the masses and ephemerides of solar system bodies (see the next section and [23]).

III. ANALYTICAL MODEL AND SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTIES

ORBIT14 integrates the orbits of EMB and Mercury, while the trajectories of planets and asteroids are taken from JPL ephemerides. The position of the Sun is obtained from Eq. (5) as a function of positions and (relativistic) masses of the other bodies.

We want to test how the spurious signal due to a wrong value of the mass of a planet affects the estimation of η. This kind of test cannot be performed by *ORBIT14*. In fact, we could try to fit the simulated data by using a model with a slightly different value of the mass. At the first iteration, the modeled barycentric orbits of the planets are the same of the data, since they come from ephemerides, but the position of the Sun is slightly different due to the different mass of the planet. Hence, all mutual distances among solar system bodies are altered and the modeled MPO-Earth range turns to be very different from the simulated data. This implies an unphysical systematic effect on the parameters estimation. The parameter η heavily feels this effect because it enters into the relativistic equation of the center of mass Eq. (5).

To perform this test, we develop a heliocentric analytical model and we include in our calculus the parameters whose signals are expected to be correlated with the SEP violation signature.
In order to avoid systematic effects, GPs must be added to the set of parameters to be fitted and their errors must be taken into account in terms of constraints (hereafter *apriori*) to be included to the global covariance analysis. All signals involved in the relativity experiment have frequencies of the same order of planetary mean motions. For this reason, we can neglect the motion of MPO around Mercury (the orbital period is approximately 2 hrs) and we will consider the Mercury-Earth range.
Current uncertainties of planetary GPs go from 2.8×10^{-4} (Mars) to ≈ 10.5 [$\mathrm{km}^3/\mathrm{s}^2$] (Neptune) [24]. Regarding asteroids, relative errors can be very large (50% or more).
To summarize, we will calculate the signatures on the Earth-Mercury range due to:

1. initial conditions of Earth and Mercury,
2. SEP violation (parameter: η),
3. planets/asteroids (parameters to be fitted: GPs),
4. secular variation of Sun's GP μ_0. Parameters to be fitted are δ_{μ_0} (displacement from the nominal GP of the Sun at the starting epoch) and its rate of change in time $\zeta = \dot{\mu}_0/\mu_0$,

5. PN parameter $\bar{\beta} = \beta - 1$,

6. Sun's quadrupole coefficient $J_{2\odot}$.

The parameter γ, which is related to the curvature produced by unit rest mass, for simplicity has not been considered. However, this is not reductive since the best estimation of γ is expected to be given after the dedicated superior conjunction experiment (SCE) and its RMS $\sigma[\gamma] = 2.0 \times 10^{-6}$ will be inserted as an *apriori* into the Nordtvedt equation.

A. Analytical model

We adopt the notation of [25]: we define $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i$ and $r_{ij} = ||\mathbf{r}_{ij}||$ where $\mathbf{r}_i$ is the coordinate of planet i in an inertial reference frame.
Planets are numbered from 1 (Mercury) to 8 (Neptune), while 0 is referred to the Sun.
We will use subscripts/superscripts i and k to indicate Mercury and Earth, respectively, while j will be used for an arbitrary *perturber* body (planet or asteroid).
We call $\mathbf{q} = \{q_1, ..., q_N\}$ the set of parameters to be fitted and $\rho_{13}(t, \mathbf{q})$ the analytical model of the Mercury-Earth range to be calculated as a function of $\mathbf{q}$.
We will describe the motion of the planet i as a small perturbation from a heliocentric circular orbit with radius R_{0i} equal to the semimajor axis and mean motion $n_i = \left[(\mu_0 + \mu_i)/R_{0i}^3\right]^{1/2}$.
For all parameters except $J_{2\odot}$ (see below) inclinations will be neglected, while eccentricities are assumed to be zero in all cases.
The displacement from the reference orbit is $\delta\mathbf{r}_i = x_i\mathbf{u}_r^i + y_i\mathbf{u}_t^i + z_i\mathbf{u}_z^i$ where $\mathbf{u}_r^i, \mathbf{u}_t^i, \mathbf{u}_z^i$ are radial, along-track and out-of-plane unit vectors, respectively.
We will express the position of k relative to i as

$$\mathbf{r}_{ik} = \mathbf{R}_{ik} + \sum_{m=1}^{N} q_m \delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,m} \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{ik} = R_{0k}\mathbf{u}_r^k - R_{0i}\mathbf{u}_r^i$.
Since terms in the summation are small, at the first order the range is

$$\rho_{ik} = ||\mathbf{r}_{ik}|| \approx R_{ik} + \sum_n q_n \frac{\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,n} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{ik}}{R_{ik}}\,. \tag{14}$$

The factor $1/R_{ik}$ can be expressed by the Legendre polynomials P_n (for $R_{0i} < R_{0k}$) [26]

$$\frac{1}{R_{ik}} = \frac{1}{R_{0k}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{R_{0i}}{R_{0k}}\right)^n P_n(\cos\Phi_{ik}) \tag{15}$$

where we defined $\Phi_i = n_i t + \varphi_i$ and $\Phi_{ik} = (n_k - n_i)\,t + \varphi_k - \varphi_i$.
Afterwards, for each q_n we will calculate the corresponding $\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,m}$.

We decompose the perturbation on i (or k) as a sum of radial and along-track forces $\sum_n q'_n(R_n^i\mathbf{u}_r^i + T_n^i\mathbf{u}_t^i)$, where $\mathbf{q}'$ represents the subset of $N-12$ *dynamical* parameters to be estimated (all but initial conditions of Earth and Mercury). For simplicity we assume that perturbations are on the ecliptic plane.
Since we are assuming that $||\delta\mathbf{r}_i|| \ll R_{0i}$, we can use the first order Hill's equations [27]. They are

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_i - 2\,n_i\dot{y}_i - 3\,n_i^2 x_i &= \sum_n q'_n R_n^i \\ \ddot{y}_i + 2\,n_i\dot{x}_i &= \sum_n q'_n T_n^i \\ \ddot{z}_i + n_i^2 z_i &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Solutions are the sum of the homogeneous part $\{\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i\}$ plus the contributions $\{x'_i, y'_i, z'_i\}$ due to the perturbing forces. Since Eq. (16) are linear, the inhomogeneous terms can be calculated once at time and finally summed together.

1. *Initial conditions*

Here we calculate the signature on range due to initial conditions of Earth and Mercury. We consider two cases: initial conditions expressed in heliocentric and in barycentric (SSB) reference frame. In this latter case and additional signal which depends on η must be included.
Referring to Eq. (16), we express the state vector $\mathbf{v} = \{x_i, y_i, z_i, \dot{x}_i, \dot{y}_i, \dot{z}_i\}$ of body i as

$$\mathbf{v} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{v}'\mathbf{q}' \tag{17}$$

where the first term on the right side represents the homogeneous solution of Eq. (16). It is the product of a 6x6 matrix $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ [see Eq. (A1) in Appendix] and the vector $\mathbf{A}$ of 6 coefficients to be fixed by the initial conditions.
The second term, the inhomogeneous solution, is the product of the $6 \times (N-12)$ matrix $\mathbf{v}'$ of the particular solutions and the column vector $\mathbf{q}'$ of the parameters q'_n.
We pass to the coordinate system with fixed axes, and we express the state vector as $\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{R}\,\delta\mathbf{x}$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the corresponding rotation matrix [see Eq. (A3)].
We rewrite $\mathbf{A}$ in terms of $\delta\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ at $t = 0$ (say $\delta\mathbf{x}_0, \mathcal{R}_0$) and, defining $\mathcal{V} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}\,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0^{-1}$ [see Eq. (A2)], we get

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{V}\,\mathcal{R}_0\,\delta\mathbf{x}_0 + (\mathbf{v}' - \mathcal{V}\,\mathbf{v}'_0)\,\mathbf{q}'\,. \tag{18}$$

The first term represents the "signal" due to initial conditions $\delta\mathbf{x}_0$, while the signal due to parameter q'_n (the term into brackets) is the sum of the particular solution $\mathbf{v}'$ plus the homogeneous solution corresponding to $\delta\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$.
The complete set of parameters to be determined by the ranging between i and k is

$$\mathbf{q} = \{\delta\mathbf{x}_0^i, \delta\mathbf{x}_0^k, \mathbf{q}'\}\,. \tag{19}$$

Defining 6x6 matrix $f_{\alpha\mu}^i$ and $6 \times (N-12)$ matrix $g_{\alpha\mu}^i$ as

$$f_{\alpha\mu}^i = \mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{V}\mathcal{R}_0; \qquad g_{\alpha\mu}^i = \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{v}' - \mathcal{V}\,\mathbf{v}'_0) \tag{20}$$

($\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are referred to body i) and using $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ to indicate the spatial components in the fixed axes coordinate system of $\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,m}$, we get

$$\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,m} = \begin{cases} -f^i_{\alpha\lambda} & \lambda = m \text{ and } m \leq 6; \\ f^k_{\alpha\lambda} & \lambda = m-6 \text{ and } 7 \leq m \leq 12; \\ g^k_{\alpha\lambda} - g^i_{\alpha\lambda} & \lambda = m-12 \text{ and } m > 12. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

Finally, by Eqs. (14, 21) we obtain the perturbation on range due to each element of $\mathbf{q}$.
The barycentric initial state vector $\mathbf{X}^i_0$ is related to the heliocentric one by

$$\mathbf{X}^i_0 = (1 + \eta\Omega_0)\mathbf{R}_0 + R_{0i}\mathbf{s}_i + \delta\mathbf{x}^i_0 \tag{22}$$

where

$$\mathbf{s}_j = \{\cos\varphi_j, \sin\varphi_j, 0, -n_j \sin\varphi_i, n_j \cos\varphi_i, 0\} \tag{23}$$

and

$$\mathbf{R}_0 = -\frac{\sum_{j\neq 0} \mu_j R_{0j}\mathbf{s}_j}{\sum_j \mu_j} \tag{24}$$

is the position of the Sun with respect to the SSB in the case $\eta = 0$. Therefore, if we pass to barycentric initial conditions we must take into account additional signals due to μ_js and η.
By Eq. (22) we can express Eq. (18) as a function of $\mathbf{X}^i_0$. Adopting now $\mathbf{q} = \{\mathbf{X}^i_0, \mathbf{X}^k_0, \mathbf{q}'\}$, we calculate the extra signals due to η and μ_l to be added to $\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik,m}$ in Eq. (21). They are reported in Eq. (B1).

2. *SEP violation and planets/asteroids contributions*

In the heliocentric reference frame the equations of motion of a planet i, in the case $\eta \neq 0$, are [2, 4, 11, 26, 28]

$$\ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} = -\frac{\mu^\star}{r^3_{0i}}\mathbf{r}_{0i} + \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \mu_j \left[(1 + \eta\,\Omega_i)\frac{\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{r^3_{ij}} - (1 + \eta\,\Omega_0)\frac{\mathbf{r}_{0j}}{r^3_{0j}} \right], \tag{25}$$

where the summation is extended to all solar system bodies and

$$\mu^\star = \mu_0 + \mu_i + \eta(\mu_i\Omega_0 + \mu_0\Omega_i)\,. \tag{26}$$

From Eq. (25) a high correlation among planetary perturbations (depending on μ_j) and SEP violation is evident. We separate the contributions of parameters η and μ_j and we project them on radial and along-track directions. Since $\Omega_i \ll \Omega_0$, the SEP violation contribution can be simplified [4, 23, 26]

$$\begin{aligned} R^i_\eta &\approx -\Omega_i n_i^2 R_{0i} - \Omega_0 \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \frac{\cos\Phi_{ij}}{R^2_{0j}}\,; \\ T^i_\eta &\approx -\Omega_0 \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \frac{\sin\Phi_{ij}}{R^2_{0j}}\,; \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

[see Eq. (C1) for the complete expression].
The signal contains a small permanent radial displacement due to a "direct" term $\propto \Omega_i$ and an "indirect" term, which depend on Ω_0. These terms have been calculated in the SSB frame in Sec. II [see Eq. (8)].
The particular solution of Eq. (16) relative to parameter η can be written as $\{x'_{i,\eta}, y'_{i,\eta}\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} x'_{i,\eta} &= \Omega_i \frac{R_{0i}}{3} + \Omega_0 \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mu_j}{R^2_{0j}} \frac{1 + 2\,n_i/n_{ji}}{n^2_{ji} - n^2_i} \cos\Phi_{ji}, \\ y'_{i,\eta} &= -\Omega_0 \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\mu_j}{R^2_{0j}} \frac{1 + 2\,n_i/n_{ji} + 3\,n^2_i/n^2_{ji}}{n^2_{ji} - n^2_i} \sin\Phi_{ji}. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Similarly, perturbations on planet i due to body j are (radial and along-track) [26]

$$\begin{aligned} R^i_{\mu_j} &= \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \left(\frac{R_{0j}\cos\Phi_{ij} - R_{0i}}{R^3_{ij}} - \frac{\cos\Phi_{ij}}{R^2_{0j}} \right), \\ T^i_{\mu_j} &= \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \left(\frac{R_{0j}}{R^3_{ij}} - \frac{1}{R^2_{0j}} \right) \sin\Phi_{ij}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The coefficient $1/R^3_{ij}$ can be calculated from Eq. (15) and expressed as a Fourier cosine series with fundamental frequency Φ_{ij} [see Eq. (D1)]. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} R^i_{\mu_j} &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} a_{j,l} \cos(l\,\Phi_{ij}); \\ T^i_{\mu_j} &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_{j,l} \sin(l\,\Phi_{ij}); \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

and coefficients $a_{j,l}$ and $b_{j,l}$ are reported in Eq. (D2).
The radial and along-track components of $\{x'_{i,\mu_j}, y'_{i,\mu_j}\}$ are, respectively

$$x'_{i,\mu_j} = -\frac{a_{j0}}{3\,n^2_i} - \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{j,l} - 2b_{j,l}/(ln_{ji})}{l^2 n^2_{ji} - n^2_i} \cos\Phi_{ji}\,;$$

$$y'_{i,\mu_j} = -\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_{j,l} - 2a_{j,l}n_i/(ln_{ji}) + 3b_{j,l}n^2_i/(l^2 n^2_{ji})}{l^2 n^2_{ji} - n^2_i} \sin\Phi_{ji}\,. \tag{31}$$

Finally, by applying Eq. (14) and Eq. (21), the Earth-Mercury range perturbations due to parameters η can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\rho^\eta_{13} = &\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}_l \cos(l\,\Phi_{13}) + \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j=pl.\\+ast.}} \sum_{\substack{p,q,r\\ \in\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{I}^{pqr}_j \cos(p\,\Phi_1 + q\,\Phi_3 + r\,\Phi_j) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where coefficients $\mathcal{D}_l$ are due to the "direct effect" and they depend only on Ω_1 and Ω_3.

For all perturbing bodies considered, we calculated the numerical values of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ using the complete expression Eq. (C1). They are reported (for planets from Mars to Neptune) in Table IV.
An analog expression can be written for the perturbation due to body j

$$\delta\rho_{13}^{\mu_j} = \sum_{\substack{p,q,r \\ \in\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{J}^{pqr} \cos\left(p\,\Phi_1 + q\,\Phi_3 + r\,\Phi_j\right). \tag{33}$$

Numerical coefficients for $\mathcal{J}$ are reported in Table V.

3. Range signature due to a variation of Sun's GP

It is well known that the GP of the Sun is not constant in time due to Sun's mass loss and to a possible (but unconfirmed) dependence of G on time.
Matematically this corresponds to

$$GM_\odot(t) = \mu_0\left[1 + \zeta(t - t_0)\right] + \delta_{\mu_0} \tag{34}$$

where t_0 is the epoch (hereafter $t_0 = 0$) when the GP of the Sun is equal to $\mu_0 + \delta_{\mu_0}$. The small parameter δ_{μ_0} has been introduced to account that true and nominal value μ_0 of the GP of the Sun are not the same. The parameter $\zeta = \dot{\mu}_0/\mu_0$ is a small (constant) rate of change.
If $\zeta \neq 0$ and/or μ_0 is slightly different from the nominal value, a radial perturbation will be present. The Hill's equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_i - 2n_i\dot{y}_i - 3n_i^2 x_i &= -\frac{\delta_{\mu_0} + \mu_0\zeta\, t}{R_{0i}^3}\,, \\ \ddot{y}_i + 2n_i\dot{x}_i &= 0\,; \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

and a particular solution is

$$x_i' = -\frac{\delta_{\mu_0} + \mu_0\zeta\, t}{n_i^2 R_{0i}^2}; \qquad y_i' = \frac{\mu_0\zeta t^2 + 2\delta_{\mu_0} t}{n_i R_{0i}^2}\,. \tag{36}$$

By Eqs. (14), (21) we obtain the range signature due to ζ and δ_{μ_0}.

4. Range signature due to $\beta \neq 1$

The PN parameter β is related to the nonlinearity in the superposition of gravity. In GR is, by definition, $\beta = 1$.
Defining the small parameter $\bar{\beta} = \beta - 1$, the perturbing force per unit mass on body i in an inertial frame is

$$\mathbf{a}_\beta^i = -\frac{2\bar{\beta}}{c^2}\sum_{j\neq i}\frac{\mu_j \mathbf{r}_{ij}}{r_{ij}^3}\left[\sum_{h\neq i}\frac{\mu_h}{r_{ih}} + \sum_{k\neq j}\frac{\mu_k}{r_{jk}}\right]. \tag{37}$$

We calculate it in the heliocentric frame $\mathbf{a}_\beta^i - \mathbf{a}_\beta^0$. The biggest term is $2\bar{\beta}/c^2\mu_0^2/R_{0i}^3\,\mathbf{u}_r^i$ and all others are at least 3 orders of magnitude smaller.
The effect due to $\bar{\beta}$ is essentially a radial force, as for δ_{μ_0} and ζ. A particular solution is

$$x_i = \bar{\beta}\frac{2\mu_0^2}{R_{0i}^3 n_i^2 c^2}, \qquad y_i = -\bar{\beta}\frac{4\mu_0^2}{R_{0i}^3 c^2 n_i}\,t\,; \tag{38}$$

and, by Eqs. (14), (21) we obtain the range signature for $\bar{\beta}$.

5. Range signature due to Sun's $J_{2\odot}$

So far, inclinations have been neglected: all planets are assumed to orbit on the ecliptical plane, but in this case we will consider the orbital inclinations with respect to the Sun's equatorial plane. This is necessary to avoid a fictitious strong correlation between $J_{2\odot}$ and $\bar{\beta}$, μ_0 or ζ. Inclinations of Mercury and Earth orbits with respect to the Sun's equator are 3.380° and 7.155° respectively.
Unit vectors $\mathbf{u}_r$, $\mathbf{u}_t$ and $\mathbf{u}_z$ have been rewritten to take into account the orbital elements of the planet.
The perturbation of Sun's $J_{2\odot}$ on the trajectory of a planet can be obtained by solving this set of equations [29]

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x} - 2(nc)\dot{y} - (5c^2 - 2)n^2 x &= -3\alpha n^2(3 + 5s)\cos(2nct + \varphi) \\ \ddot{y} + 2(nc)\dot{x} &= -2\alpha n^2(3 + 5s)\sin(2nct + \varphi) \\ \ddot{z} + (3c^2 - 2)n^2 z &= -2\beta n^2 s\sqrt{1 + 3s}\sin(nct + \varphi) \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &c = \sqrt{1 + s}; \qquad s = \frac{3J_{2\odot}R_\odot^2}{8r^2}\left[1 + 3\cos(2I)\right]; \\ &\alpha = \frac{3J_{2\odot}R_\odot^2}{8r(3 + 5s)}\left[1 - \cos(2I)\right]; \quad \beta = \frac{3J_{2\odot}R_\odot^2}{4rs\sqrt{1 + 3s}}\sin(2I)\,; \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

and I is the inclination, $R_\odot$ is the radius of the Sun, n is the mean motion, r is the Sun-planet distance and φ is the initial phase.
Hill's equations have been modified by increasing the angular velocity of the reference frame from n up to $n\,c$ in order to avoid drifts into the inhomogeneous solutions [see [29] for details]. The particular solution is

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= \alpha\cos(2nct + \varphi)\,, \\ y' &= \alpha\frac{1 + 3s}{2(1 + s)}\sin(2nct + \varphi)\,, \\ z' &= -\beta\sqrt{1 + 3s}\sin(nct + \varphi)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Since Eq. (41) are not linear functions of $J_{2\odot}$, we expand them as MacLaurin series of $J_{2\odot}$ up to the first order (for Mercury and Earth).
By Eqs. (14) and (21) we estimate the perturbation on the range due to $J_{2\odot}$.

6. Time sampling

Due to the visibility windows, as described in Sec. II A, range and range-rate data contain several gaps. A gap occurs approximately at each arc and lasts about 9.3 hrs. To perform a realistic calculus, we evaluate the perturbations at the set of epochs t_i (spanning an interval of 373 d) generated by *ORBIT14*. A low-frequency sampling ($f_s = 10^{-4}$ Hz) is sufficient for our purposes since signals involved have frequencies of the same order of planetary mean motions. For the RMS $\hat{\sigma}_i$ relative to the i-th range data, we adopt [17]

$$\hat{\sigma}_i = 15\,\mathrm{cm}\,\sqrt{300 f_s} \approx 2.6\,\mathrm{cm} \tag{42}$$

7. Constraints and covariance matrix calculus

As explained in Sec. II B, there is a subset of M parameters $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, ..., x_M\} \in \mathbf{q}$ for which information are available by other experiments. In our case they are the GPs and γ. The information about γ from SCE affects β and η thanks to the Nordtvedt equation.
We define the *apriori* observations as $\mathbf{x}^P$ and $\mathbf{C}^P$ as the non-diagonal *apriori* normal matrix used to represent the information available about parameters $\mathbf{x}$. Errors relative to the *apriori* constraints being σ_i with $i = 1 \dots M$. The constraint involving the subset $\mathbf{x}$ can be written as $\mathbf{C}^P\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{C}^P\mathbf{x}^P$.
Following [17], we modify Eq. (9) by including the constraints

$$Q(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{m+M}\left[\boldsymbol{\xi}^T(\mathbf{q})\mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{q}) + (\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^P)^T\mathbf{C}^P(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^P)\right]. \tag{43}$$

In our case we have

$$(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^P)^T\mathbf{C}^P(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^P) = \frac{(\eta - 4\bar{\beta})^2}{\sigma_N^2} + \sum_i \frac{(\mu_i - \mu_i^P)^2}{\sigma_i^2} \tag{44}$$

where $\sigma_N = 2.0 \times 10^{-6}$ is the expected RMS of γ after SCE, while the summation is extended to all GPs and σ_i are the corresponding errors.
By means of well known formulas, we obtain the normal matrix $\mathbf{C}$ and its inverse, the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Finally, the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ give us the expected RMSs of the parameters.
For a large fraction of asteroids GPs are estimated by ground-based measurements of diameters and supposed density values, therefore uncertainties are large.
However, at the epoch of BC mission, a certain number of GPs will become more precise thanks to GAIA mission by precise measurements of the perturbations on Mars orbit and asteroid-asteroid close approaches.
By DAWN measurements the error of 4 Vesta's GP is now 1.2×10^{-5} [km^3/s^2] [30], while the GP of 1 Ceres has been recently estimated with an error of 8.0×10^{-4} [km^3/s^2] [31].
The current error $\sigma[\mu_5] = 2.7$ [km^3/s^2] of the GP of the Jupiter system could be improved by JUNO mission measurements up to $\sigma[\mu_5] = 0.53$ (X-band) or 0.20 [km^3/s^2] (K_a-band) [32].
In [33] a list of asteroids with their expected relative errors on GPs after GAIA mission, is reported, 62 of them belong to the sample of 343 asteroids we considered. We perform tests with both the "current" and the "expected" values (reported in Table II).

Body	GPs errors [km^3/s^2] (curr.)	(exp.)	refs
Venus	0.0063	0.0063	[24]
Mars	0.00028	0.00028	[24]
Jupiter	2.7	0.5	[24, 32]
Saturn	1.1	1.1	[24]
Uranus	5.0	5.0	[24]
Neptune	10.5	10.5	[24]
Pluto	2.1	2.1	[34]
Eris	13.1	13.1	[24]
1 Ceres	0.0008	0.0008	[31]
2 Pallas	0.28	0.17	[24, 33]
3 Juno	0.11	0.037	[24, 33]
4 Vesta	0.000012	0.000012	[30]
10 Hygiea	0.48	0.043	[33]
704 Interamnia	0.47	0.11	[33]
...	...	...	...

TABLE II. Current and "expected" uncertainties for GPs of planets/asteroids. For Jupiter, the improvement could be reached by JUNO mission data, for the others in the list, by GAIA.

8. Results

We made a preliminary test to check the results of the analytical model with those of the nominal experiment described in Sec. II B. Therefore, we perform the covariance analysis for the following set of parameters only: barycentric initial conditions of Mercury and Earth plus $\bar{\beta}$, η, δ_{μ_0}, $J_{2\odot}$ and ζ.
Results are reported in col. (1) of Table III, by comparing with the RMSs of Table I we find a very good agreement. In particular, the outcome for η from the analytical model is $\sigma[\eta] = 1.58 \times 10^{-6}$, to be compared with 1.93×10^{-6} of *ORBIT14*.
After the validation of the analytical model, we did two experiments with an extended set of parameters.
In both cases we added to the list the GPs of planets from Jupiter to Neptune plus Pluto, Eris and the whole sample of asteroids (343) involved in the dynamics of *ORBIT14*. The total number of parameters was 362. The Nordtvedt apriori has been included in both experiments.
In the first experiment, we adopt for the aprioris the *current* errors of GPs, while in the other we use the *expected* ones, according to values reported in Table II. Results are reported in columns (2) and (3) of Table III.
The resulting RMS of the parameter η is about 1 order of magnitude with respect to the ideal case.

The difference between the two experiments (current and expected) is small: the aprioris with the expected values improve the RMS of η by only a factor 1.4 leading to $\sigma[\eta] = 3.1 \times 10^{-5}$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we described in details a semi-analytical model for the Earth-Mercury ranging for the Bepi-Colombo mission. Our purpose was the estimation of the RMS of the Nordtvedt parameter η by a global covariance analysis. The frequency of signal due to η in the Earth-Mercury range is of the same order of planetary mean motions and the parameters that could be in principle correlated with η are the initial conditions of Earth and Mercury, the other PN parameters, and the masses of planets and asteroids. We included them in the list of parameters by calculating their signals on the range.

In order to check the analytical model we performed a preliminary covariance analysis, involving 13 parameters, to be compared with the numerical global-fit obtained by *ORBIT14* in the "ideal" case of exact knowledge of the masses of planets and asteroids. We found that the RMSs given by our model were in good agreement with those estimated by *ORBIT14*.

Afterwards, we included to the parameters list the masses of planets and the 343 more massive asteroids (the total number of parameters was 362). The RMSs of the masses have been constrained to their current (or expected at the epoch of the mission) values and we found $\sigma[\eta] = 4.37 \times 10^{-5}$ and $\sigma[\eta] = 3.13 \times 10^{-5}$, respectively. Therefore, the uncertainties of the masses of solar system bodies degradate the precision of the estimation of η of about 1 order of magnitude. However, since the current RMS of η, from LLR measurements, is $\sigma[\eta] = 4.4 \times 10^{-4}$, we conclude that the BepiColombo relativity experiment can improve the current precision on η by a factor 10.

		Relativity experiment (integration time: 373 d)		
parameter	units	(1)	(2)	(3)
$X_{0,m}$	[cm]	0.29	2.51×10^{3}	2.49×10^{3}
$Y_{0,m}$	[cm]	0.88	1.19×10^{4}	1.18×10^{4}
$Z_{0,m}$	[cm]	4.62	5.38	5.15
$\dot{X}_{0,m}$	[cm s^{-1}]	3.91×10^{-7}	2.38×10^{-3}	2.36×10^{-3}
$\dot{Y}_{0,m}$	[cm s^{-1}]	2.93×10^{-7}	1.70×10^{-3}	1.68×10^{-3}
$\dot{Z}_{0,e}$	[cm s^{-1}]	3.90×10^{-6}	4.76×10^{-6}	4.72×10^{-6}
$\dot{X}_{0,e}$	[cm s^{-1}]	1.04×10^{-7}	1.79×10^{-3}	1.77×10^{-3}
$\dot{Y}_{0,e}$	[cm s^{-1}]	1.18×10^{-7}	9.47×10^{-5}	9.41×10^{-5}
β	-	6.38×10^{-7}	1.09×10^{-5}	7.81×10^{-6}
η	-	1.58×10^{-6}	4.37×10^{-5}	3.13×10^{-5}
δ_{μ_0}	[cm^{3}s^{-2}]	9.19×10^{12}	7.69×10^{13}	5.50×10^{13}
$J_{2\odot}$	-	3.80×10^{-10}	8.49×10^{-10}	8.03×10^{-10}
ζ	[yr^{-1}]	1.22×10^{-14}	1.93×10^{-14}	1.78×10^{-14}
...			...	...

TABLE III. RMSs of the parameters obtained by the analytical global covariance analysis.
(1) Metric+SCE experiment assuming no errors on GPs (to be compared with numerical results listed in Table I). (2) Metric+SCE experiment assuming "current" errors on GPs. (3) as (2) but with "expected" errors on GPs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FDM acknowledges the advice and support of N. Ashby and P. Bender (University of Colorado, Boulder) for fruitful interaction on the development of analytical models.

The results of the research presented in this work have been performed within the scope of the contract ASI/2007/I/082/06/0 with the Italian Space Agency.

Appendix A: Matrices

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(nt) & \sin(nt) & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2\sin(nt) & 2\cos(nt) & -3nt/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos(nt) & \sin(nt) \\ -n\sin(nt) & n\cos(nt) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2n\cos(nt) & -2n\sin(nt) & -3n/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -n\sin(nt) & n\cos(nt) \end{pmatrix} \tag{A1}$$

$$\mathcal{V} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}\,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 4-3\cos(nt) & 0 & 0 & \sin(nt)/n & 2\left[1-\cos(nt)\right]/n & 0 \\ 6\left[\sin(nt)-nt\right] & 1 & 0 & 2\left[\cos(nt)-1\right]/n & -3t+4\sin(nt)/n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos(nt) & 0 & 0 & \sin(nt)/n \\ 3n\sin(nt) & 0 & 0 & \cos(nt) & 2\sin(nt) & 0 \\ 6n\left[\cos(nt)-1\right] & 0 & 0 & -2\sin(nt) & -3+4\cos(nt) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -n\sin(nt) & 0 & 0 & \cos(nt) \end{pmatrix} \tag{A2}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(nt) & \sin(nt) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin(nt) & \cos(nt) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -n\sin(nt) & n\cos(nt) & 0 & \cos(nt) & \sin(nt) & 0 \\ -n\cos(nt) & -n\sin(nt) & 0 & -\sin(nt) & \cos(nt) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \end{pmatrix} \tag{A3}$$

Appendix B: Additional signals due to barycentric initial conditions

The extra terms to be added to Eq. (21), if initial conditions are barycentric, are $g^k - g^i$ where

$$g^i = -\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{V}\mathcal{R}_0 \begin{cases} \Omega_0 \mathbf{R}_0 & q_m = \eta; \\ (R_{0l}\mathbf{s}_l + \mathbf{R}_0)/\mu_T & q_m = \mu_l \neq \mu_0; \\ \mathbf{R}_0/\mu_T & q_m = \mu_l = \mu_0; \end{cases} \tag{B1}$$

where μ_T is the total mass (Sun, planets and asteroids) and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{V}$, $\mathbf{s}_l$ are calculated for body i.

Appendix C: Complete SEP violation perturbing term

Complete radial and along-track perturbations on planet i due to SEP violation

$$\begin{aligned} R^i_\eta &= -\frac{\mu_i\Omega_0 + \mu_0\Omega_i}{R^2_{0i}} + \\ &\quad + \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \mu_j \left(\Omega_i \frac{R_{0j}\cos\Phi_{ij} - R_{0i}}{R^3_{ij}} - \Omega_0 \frac{\cos\Phi_{ij}}{R^2_{0j}} \right) \\ T^i_\eta &= \sum_{j\neq i\neq 0} \mu_j \sin\Phi_{ij} \left(\Omega_i \frac{R_{0j}}{R^3_{ij}} - \Omega_0 \frac{1}{R^2_{0j}} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

Appendix D: Coefficients for planetary perturbations

Series expansion for $1/R^3_{ij}$, here $R_{0i} < R_{0j}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{R^3_{ij}} &= \left(\frac{1}{R^3_{0j}} + \frac{9}{4}\frac{R^2_{0i}}{R^5_{0j}} + \dots \right) + \\ &\quad + \left(3\,\frac{R_{0i}}{R^4_{0j}} + \frac{45}{8}\frac{R^3_{0i}}{R^6_{0j}} + \dots \right) \cos\Phi_{ij} + \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{15}{4}\,\frac{R^2_{0i}}{R^5_{0j}} + \frac{105}{16}\frac{R^4_{0i}}{R^7_{0j}} + \dots \right) \cos 2\Phi_{ij} + \dots \end{aligned} \tag{D1}$$

Radial ($a_{j,l}$) and along-track ($b_{j,l}$) coefficients of the perturbation on body i due to body j [see Eq. (30)]

$$\begin{aligned} a_{j,0} &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{R_{0i}}{R^3_{0j}} + \frac{9}{16}\frac{R^3_{0i}}{R^5_{0j}} + \frac{75}{128}\frac{R^5_{0i}}{R^7_{0j}} \dots ; \\ a_{j,1} &= \frac{9}{8}\frac{R^2_{0i}}{R^4_{0j}} + \frac{75}{64}\frac{R^4_{0i}}{R^6_{0j}} + \frac{305}{512}\frac{R^6_{0i}}{R^8_{0j}} + \cdots ; \\ a_{j,2} &= \frac{3}{2}\frac{R_{0i}}{R^3_{0j}} + \frac{5}{4}\frac{R^3_{0i}}{R^5_{0j}} + \frac{315}{256}\frac{R^5_{0i}}{R^4_{0j}} + \cdots ; \\ b_{j,1} &= \frac{3}{8}\frac{R^2_{0i}}{R^4_{0j}} + \frac{15}{64}\frac{R^4_{0i}}{R^6_{0j}} + \frac{95}{512}\frac{R^6_{0i}}{R^8_{0j}} + \cdots ; \\ b_{j,2} &= \frac{3}{2}\frac{R_{0i}}{R^3_{0j}} + \frac{5}{8}\frac{R^3_{0i}}{R^5_{0j}} + \frac{105}{256}\frac{R^5_{0i}}{R^7_{0j}} + \cdots ; \end{aligned} \tag{D2}$$

Appendix E: Amplitudes and frequencies for SEP violation and planetary signatures

	Direct terms ($\mathcal{D}_l$)		Indirect terms ($\mathcal{I}_{pqr}$)									
			Mars		Jupiter		Saturn		Uranus		Neptune	
frequency	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]
0	∞	-22.48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$n_1 - n_3$	115.9	1.49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$n_j - n_3$			747.3	0.36	398.8	232.81	378.09	47.34	369.66	4.92	367.5	4.59
$n_1 - n_j$			100.3	-0.30	89.8	-137.31	88.7	-27.27	88.2	-2.81	88.1	-2.61
$n_1 + n_j - 2n_3$			137.1	0.28	163.3	118.88	167.1	23.42	168.8	2.40	169.2	2.23
$2n_1 - 2n_3$	57.9	-0.56	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$2n_1 + n_j - 3n_3$			62.8	0.06	67.8	29.04	68.4	5.76	68.7	0.59	68.8	0.55
$2n_1 - n_j - n_3$			53.8	-0.02	50.6	20.36	50.2	4.74	50.1	0.52	50.05	0.49
$3n_1 - 3n_3$	38.6	-0.19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$3n_1 + n_j - 4n_3$			40.7	0.01	42.8	4.47	43.0	0.87	43.1	0.09	43.2	0.08
$3n_1 - n_j - 2n_3$			36.7	-0.01	35.2	-2.56	35.0	-0.40	35.0	-0.04	35.0	-0.03
$4n_1 - 4n_3$	29.0	-0.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$4n_1 - n_j - 3n_3$			27.9	-	27.0	2.35	26.9	0.51	26.9	0.05	26.9	0.05
$2n_j - 2n_3$			373.7	-	199.4	-	189.0	-	184.8	-	183.7	-
$n_1 - 2n_j + n_3$			88.4	-	73.3	-	71.8	-	71.2	-	71.1	-
$n_1 + 2n_j - 3n_3$			168.0	-	276.6	-	299.4	-	310.6	-	313.7	-
$5n_1 - 5n_3$	23.2	0.06	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

TABLE IV. SEP violation range signature: coefficients relative to the direct and indirect parts (for $\eta = 1$). Only terms bigger than 1 cm are reported. See Eq. (32).

Coefficients $\mathcal{J}$ of Earth-Mercury range perturbation										
	Mars		Jupiter		Saturn		Uranus		Neptune	
frequency	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]	period [d]	ampl [m]
0	∞	-1178.5	∞	-162393.6	∞	-7941.0	∞	-149.2	∞	-45.7
$5n_j - 5n_3$	149.5	-759.0	79.8	-345.1	75.6	-2.4	73.9	-	73.5	-
$4n_j - 4n_3$	186.8	-4089.4	99.7	-5517.9	94.5	-70.7	92.4	-0.3	91.9	-
$3n_j - 3n_3$	249.1	-30352.7	132.9	-92266.9	126.0	-2127.8	123.2	-18.7	122.5	-3.6
$2n_j - 2n_3$	373.7	1405238.7	199.4	-1303037.9	189.0	-52886.5	184.8	-921.9	183.7	-277.2
$n_j - n_3$	747.3	30357.6	398.8	2143106.1	378.1	134196.8	369.7	3498.7	367.5	1334.9
$n_1 + 5n_j - 6n_3$	515.6	-184.3	255.9	-68.9	217.6	-0.5	204.2	-	201.0	-
$n_1 + 4n_j - 5n_3$	305.1	-1098.4	714.2	-1154.8	512.9	-14.5	456.4	-	443.5	-
$n_1 + 3n_j - 4n_3$	216.7	-9127.3	903.1	-20781.5	1438.5	-469.6	1944.8	-4.10	2144.8	-0.8
$n_1 + 2n_j - 3n_3$	168.0	535946.3	276.6	-343492.5	299.4	-13562.0	310.6	-233.8	313.7	-70.1
$n_1 + n_j - 2n_3$	137.1	20384.6	163.3	892047.9	167.1	53440.7	168.8	1367.1	169.2	519.0
$n_1 - n_3$	115.9	88.2	115.9	9656.0	115.9	471.7	115.9	8.9	115.9	2.7
$n_1 - n_j$	100.3	-21612.9	89.8	-982233.0	88.7	-59100.9	88.2	-1514.8	88.10	-575.4
$n_1 - 2n_j + n_3$	88.4	-588309.0	73.3	422347.3	71.8	16944.1	71.2	294.1	71.1	88.3
$n_1 - 3n_j + 2n_3$	79.1	10278.3	61.9	24391.7	60.4	553.2	59.7	4.8	59.5	0.9
$n_1 - 4n_j + 3n_3$	71.5	1252.6	53.6	1363.6	52.1	17.2	51.4	-	51.2	-
$n_1 - 5n_j + 4n_3$	65.3	212.9	47.2	81.9	45.8	0.6	45.1	-	45.0	-
$2n_1 + 5n_j - 7n_3$	94.6	-53.9	211.8	-21.6	247.8	-0.2	267.8	-	273.7	-
$2n_1 + 4n_j - 6n_3$	84.0	-311.4	138.3	-355.6	149.7	-4.5	155.3	-	156.9	-
$2n_1 + 3n_j - 5n_3$	75.5	-2503.8	102.7	-6238.2	107.2	-142.0	109.4	-1.2	109.9	-0.2
$2n_1 + 2n_j - 4n_3$	68.6	138269.1	81.7	-98387.3	83.5	-3921.1	84.4	-67.9	84.6	-20.4
$2n_1 + n_j - 3n_3$	62.8	4726.0	67.8	225809.9	68.4	13663.2	68.7	351.0	68.8	133.4
$2n_1 - 2n_3$	57.9	-38.5	57.9	-5722.2	57.9	-279.9	57.9	-5.3	57.9	-1.6
$2n_1 - n_j - n_3$	53.8	-3189.6	50.6	-102840.3	50.2	-5908.8	50.1	-148.3	50.0	-56.0
$2n_1 - 2n_j$	50.2	-83674.5	44.9	42429.8	44.3	1617.2	44.1	27.4	44.0	8.2
$2n_1 - 3n_j + n_3$	47.0	1364.9	40.4	3385.9	39.7	78.1	39.4	0.7	39.3	0.1
$2n_1 - 4n_j + 2n_3$	44.2	152.8	36.6	143.9	35.9	1.8	35.6	-	35.5	-
$2n_1 - 5n_j + 3n_3$	41.8	24.4	33.6	8.2	32.8	-	32.5	-	32.4	-
$3n_1 + 5n_j - 8n_3$	52.1	-2.8	74.9	-0.4	79.0	-	80.9	-	81.4	-
$3n_1 + 4n_j - 7n_3$	48.7	-21.1	63.0	-9.7	65.3	-0.1	66.4	-	66.6	-
$3n_1 + 3n_j - 6n_3$	45.7	-212.4	54.4	-246.6	55.7	-5.1	56.3	-	56.4	-
$3n_1 + 2n_j - 5n_3$	43.1	16327.3	47.9	-6393.2	48.5	-238.0	48.8	-4.0	48.9	-1.2
$3n_1 + n_j - 4n_3$	40.7	857.4	42.8	29221.8	43.0	1691.4	43.1	42.6	43.2	16.1
$3n_1 - 3n_3$	38.6	29.0	38.6	3864.6	38.6	188.9	38.6	3.6	38.6	1.1
$3n_1 - n_j - 2n_3$	36.7	-1480.3	35.2	-70614.5	35.0	-4273.7	35.0	-109.8	35.0	-41.7
$3n_1 - 2n_j - n_3$	35.0	-48191.0	32.4	30888.6	32.1	1205.5	31.9	20.7	31.9	6.2
$3n_1 - 3n_j$	33.4	890.3	29.9	2187.9	29.6	49.5	29.4	0.4	29.4	-
$3n_1 - 4n_j + n_3$	32.0	116.6	27.8	151.3	27.4	1.9	27.2	-	27.2	-
$3n_1 - 5n_j + 2n_3$	30.7	20.0	26.0	8.3	25.6	-	25.4	-	25.3	-
$4n_1 - n_j - 3n_3$	27.9	20.7	27.0	2307.8	26.9	147.7	26.9	3.9	26.9	1.5
$4n_1 - 2n_j - 2n_3$	26.9	-29.7	25.3	-1437.2	25.1	-66.5	25.0	-1.2	25.0	-0.4
$4n_1 - 3n_j - n_3$	26.0	-5.6	23.8	-83.9	23.6	-2.1	23.5	-	23.4	-
$4n_1 - 4n_j$	25.1	-0.6	22.4	-3.4	22.2	-	22.1	-	22.0	-
$4n_1 - 5n_j + n_3$	24.3	0.2	21.3	0.4	20.9	-	20.8	-	20.8	-
$5n_1 - 2n_j - 3n_3$	21.8	-5.8	20.8	-264.1	20.6	-12.1	20.6	-0.2	20.6	-
$5n_1 - 3n_j - 2n_3$	21.2	-1.8	19.7	-29.1	19.6	-0.7	19.5	-	19.5	-
$5n_1 - 4n_j - n_3$	20.6	-0.3	18.8	-1.4	18.6	-	18.5	-	18.5	-
$5n_1 - 5n_j$	20.1	-	18.0	-	17.7	-	17.6	-	17.6	-
$6n_1 - 3n_j - 3n_3$	17.9	-0.3	16.9	-4.1	16.7	-0.1	16.7	-	16.7	-
$6n_1 - 4n_j - 2n_3$	17.5	-0.1	16.2	-0.6	16.0	-	16.0	-	16.0	-
$6n_1 - 5n_j - n_3$	17.1	-	15.5	-	15.4	-	15.3	-	15.3	-
$7n_1 - 4n_j - 3n_3$	15.2	-	14.2	-	14.1	-	14.0	-	14.0	-
$7n_1 - 5n_j - 2n_3$	14.9	-	13.7	-	13.6	-	13.5	-	13.5	-
$8n_1 - 5n_j - 3n_3$	13.2	-	12.3	-	12.2	-	12.1	-	12.1	-
..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

TABLE V. Earth-Mercury range perturbation coefficients due to planetary effects. Only terms bigger than 10 cm are reported.

[1] L. Iess and G. Boscagli, Planetary and Space Science **49**, 1597 (2001).
[2] A. Milani, D. Vokrouhlický, D. Villani, C. Bonanno, and A. Rossi, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 082001 (2002).
[3] T. Damour and D. Vokrouhlický, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 4177 (1996).
[4] G. Congedo and F. De Marchi, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 102003 (2016), arXiv:1602.05949 [gr-qc].
[5] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **18**, 1129 (2009).
[6] K. Nordtvedt, Phys. Rev. **170**, 1186 (1968).
[7] E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, S. Hoedl, and S. Schlamminger, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **62**, 102 (2009).
[8] P. Touboul, G. Métris, V. Lebat, and A. Robert, Classical and Quantum Gravity **29**, 184010 (2012).
[9] T. W. Murphy, Jr., E. G. Adelberger, J. B. R. Battat, C. D. Hoyle, N. H. Johnson, R. J. McMillan, C. W. Stubbs, and H. E. Swanson, Classical and Quantum Gravity **29**, 184005 (2012).
[10] S. G. Turyshev and J. G. Williams, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **16**, 2165 (2007).
[11] S. G. Turyshev, J. G. Williams, M. Shao, J. D. Anderson, K. L. Nordtvedt, Jr, and T. W. Murphy, Jr, ArXiv e-prints (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0411082.
[12] S. G. Turyshev, W. Farr, W. M. Folkner, A. R. Girerd, H. Hemmati, T. W. Murphy, J. G. Williams, and J. J. Degnan, Experimental Astronomy **28**, 209 (2010).
[13] A. Milani, G. Tommei, D. Vokrouhlický, E. Latorre, and S. Cicalò, in *Relativity in Fundamental Astronomy: Dynamics, Reference Frames, and Data Analysis*, IAU Symposium, Vol. 261, edited by S. A. Klioner, P. K. Seidelmann, and M. H. Soffel (2010) pp. 356–365.
[14] S. Cicalò, G. Schettino, S. Di Ruzza, E. M. Alessi, G. Tommei, and A. Milani, MNRAS **457**, 1507 (2016).
[15] G. Tommei, L. Dimare, D. Serra, and A. Milani, MNRAS **446**, 3089 (2015), arXiv:1411.1613 [physics.space-ph].
[16] G. Tommei, A. Milani, and D. Vokrouhlický, Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron. **107**, 285 (2010), arXiv:0910.5818 [gr-qc].
[17] A. Milani and G. Gronchi, *Theory of Orbit Determination* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
[18] Every single arc has its own set of initial conditions; in this way, the actual errors in the orbit propagation, due to lack of knowledge in the non-gravitational dynamical model, can be reduced by an over-parametrization of the initial conditions.
[19] E. M. Alessi, S. Cicalò, A. Milani, and G. Tommei, MNRAS **423**, 2270 (2012), arXiv:1202.3248 [physics.space-ph].
[20] G. Schettino, S. Cicalò, S. Di Ruzza, and G. Tommei, in *International Workshop in Metrology for Aerospace* (IEEE Proceedings, 2015) pp. 141 – 145.
[21] K. Nordtvedt, Jr., ApJ **161**, 1059 (1970).
[22] Since, from a relativistic point of view, we are not dealing with a generic space-time but with the one where we are "now", we need to solve for the initial conditions of the bodies which affect the measurements, i.e. Mercury and EMB. The other planetary ephemerides are taken by JPL ones.
[23] G. Tommei, in *On the BepiColombo and Juno radio science experiments: Precise models and critical estimates, Metrology for Aerospace (MetroAeroSpace), 2015 IEEE, pp. 323-328, 2015* (2015) pp. 323–328.
[24] B. Luzum, N. Capitaine, A. Fienga, W. Folkner, T. Fukushima, J. Hilton, C. Hohenkerk, G. Krasinsky, G. Petit, E. Pitjeva, M. Soffel, and P. Wallace, Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron. **110**, 293 (2011).
[25] T. Moyer, Deep space communications and navigation series (2000).
[26] N. Ashby, P. L. Bender, and J. M. Wahr, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 022001 (2007).
[27] W. H. Clohessy and R. S. Wiltshire, J. Aerospace Sciences **27**, 653 (1960).
[28] J. D. Anderson, M. Gross, K. L. Nordtvedt, and S. G. Turyshev, ApJ **459**, 365 (1996).
[29] S. Schweighart and R. Sedwick, in *Aerospace Conference*, Vol. 2 (IEEE Proceedings, 2001) pp. 1001 – 1019.
[30] A. S. Konopliv, S. W. Asmar, R. S. Park, B. G. Bills, F. Centinello, A. B. Chamberlin, A. Ermakov, R. W. Gaskell, N. Rambaux, C. A. Raymond, C. T. Russell, D. E. Smith, P. Tricarico, and M. T. Zuber, Icarus **240**, 103 (2014).
[31] R. S. Park, A. S. Konopliv, B. Bills, J. Castillo-Rogez, S. W. Asmar, N. Rambaux, C. A. Raymond, C. T. Russell, M. T. Zuber, A. Ermakov, S. D. King, and M. D. Rayman, in *Lunar and Planetary Science Conference*, Lunar and Planetary Science Conference, Vol. 47 (2016) p. 1781.
[32] D. Serra, *Satellite geodesy on other planets*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pisa (2016).
[33] S. Mouret, J. L. Simon, F. Mignard, and D. Hestroffer, A&A **508**, 479 (2009).
[34] S. A. Stern, F. Bagenal, K. Ennico, G. R. Gladstone, W. M. Grundy, W. B. McKinnon, J. M. Moore, C. B. Olkin, J. R. Spencer, H. A. Weaver, L. A. Young, *et al.*, Science **350**, aad1815 (2015), arXiv:1510.07704 [astro-ph.EP].